To Win Woman Suffrage Through Motion Pictures

Mrs. Medill McCormick Explains Why Suffragists Believe That Their Melodramatic Photoplay Will Prove as Effective in Gaining "Votes for Women" as "Uncle Tom's Cabin" Was in the Abolition of Slavery.

By MRS. MEDILL M'CORMICK,
Chairman of the Campaign Committee of the National American Woman's Suffrage Association.

REALIZING that the suffragists, like all other propaganda organizations, spend most of their time in talking to themselves in public, I felt it was necessary to try and originate a means of really reaching the public.

There is no opposition to Woman's Suffrage in this country, because there is no argument of moment against it. The difficulty lies in not being able to reach the actual voters and to have them understand the reasons why women are working to be enfranchised.

With this purpose in view I consulted with one of the greatest moving-picture men in the country, and, together we have worked out and are ready to produce the largest moving-picture drama yet presented to the public. It is fittingly called "Your Girl and Mine."

We have put together in this photo-play several of the most startling reasons why we wish to vote, and by weaving a romance around the illustrations we find that we are presenting to the public an interesting and exciting melodrama. In short, this is the "Uncle Tom's Cabin" of the suffrage movement.

The fact that a man has a right to deed away his children in many of the States of the Union is unknown to the mass of the men of the country as well as to the women. The abuse of the child labor laws in some of the States, where they have been established, is quite as bad as the condition existing in the States where there are now no such laws.

We also thought it necessary to paint, through the films, a picture showing the direct communication between the home and the City Hall; and between the politician's pocketbook and the unclean conditions of our cities.

We agree with the argument of the "antis" that the woman's place is in the home, and for this reason we wish to show how helpless a woman is to protect the health of her family unless she has a vote in the city council.

The National American Woman's Suffrage Association has carried on its campaign in this country for nearly fifty years upon the 50-cent subscriptions donated by the followers of the cause. The women do not have large sums of money to spend on campaigns, and it is only in rare cases that we are able to solicit funds from the men.

Every man knows what a campaign costs and how many times have we heard the politician complain because he only had forty or fifty thousand dollars for a legislative campaign fund. The entire budget of our National Association hardly amounts to this for a year's work, and at the present time we have seven campaign States where the subject of Woman's Suffrage will be submitted to the voters at the Fall election, and we are at the same time trying to carry on campaigns in the various important congressional districts.

This is another reason why we have great hopes that our moving-picture drama will be a success, for the advancement of the cause actually depends upon the play, both for the conversion of the public and the financial returns.

The photo-play, which the suffrage leaders hope will accomplish as much for their cause as the novel, "Uncle Tom's Cabin," did for the anti-slavery movement, is an elaborate production in eight reels, taking an entire afternoon or evening to present.

Over four hundred men, women and children appear in the course of the eight reels. The leading roles are taken by famous players from the legitimate stage, who have never been seen in motion pictures before—Miss Olive Wyndham, Miss Katherine Kaelred, Sidney Booth and John Charles.

Taking Harriet Beecher Stowe's famous work as their guide, the authors of "Your Girl and Mine" have been careful to avoid anything that might look like "just preaching." Their aim, first of all, was to produce a photo-play which would appeal to every man and woman, regardless of whether they knew anything about the suffrage movement or cared anything about it.

The scene of "Your Girl and Mine" is laid in one of the non-woman suffrage States and its plot is based on conditions actually existing in many of the States where women have not yet the right to vote.

When the play opens Rosalind Fairlie is living in the mansion which she has inherited from her wealthy father. Her Aunt Jane, an ardent equal suffragist, tries to interest Rosalind in working to secure women their rights, but without success.

Rosalind becomes the wife of Ben Austin—prodigal, spendthrift and libertine, but with the veneer of a well-bred gentleman. He is heavily in debt. On the eve of his wedding day his father disowns him, saying:

"I refuse to give you any more money. You are marrying a rich girl. Under the law in this State her property can be seized for your debts. Make use of the law."

Among the uninvited guests who crowd the doors of the church where the ceremony is performed is Cornelia Price, a poor working girl, who is the mother of Austin's child. Austin catches sight of her in time to avoid a scene and orders her ejected.

Austin has been quick to take advantage of his father's advice and on the way from the church the carriage in which he and his bride are riding to their home is seized by the sheriff to help satisfy some of Austin's debts. Rosalind is astounded, but her husband meets all her objections with the cool statement that "it is the law."

After Rosaland's eyes are opened to her husband's true character the scene shifts to the wretched tenement room where Cornelia Price is toiling to keep herself and baby alive. Austin visits her and offers her money. Cornelia refuses to accept it. "That money is not yours," she says. "It belongs to the woman whom you married in order legally to rob."

Then Austin, in his rage, threatens to take the despairing woman's child away from her. "I am the child's father," he leers, "and under the law of this State I am entitled to it."

A radiant woman, typifying equal suffrage, appears in a vision to both Cornelia and Rosalind and tells them that further troubles such as they are undergoing could be avoided by winning votes for women. But they refuse to heed the warning.

The fact that Rosalind becomes the mother of two children only makes Austin's treatment of her worse. He continues to claim her money and squander it on himself and his worthless friends. When Aunt Jane objects he orders her out of the house.

Aunt Jane renews her efforts to induce her niece to work for suffrage, but is met with the familiar argument that "a woman's place is in the home." The kindly old lady discovers Cornelia on one of her trips through the slums and learns the truth about the young woman's relations with Austin. They both agree that Rosalind must never know.

In the course of her efforts to secure better conditions for the tenement dwellers Aunt Jane meets Alderman Hoagland and gets from him a comprehensive idea of the rottenness of many man-made municipal governments. The absence of the fireescapes, which she had tried to induce the city council to provide results in Cornelia's little son being burned to death. But even this sorrow does not make Cornelia any more ready to follow the spirit of suffrage.

One night Cornelia, on the verge of starvation, goes into a cheap restaurant. A brute in human form buys her food and she, mistaking his intentions for kindness, eats it ravenously. When she realizes his true character she repulses his advances and calls on the management of the place to protect her. To her amazement her companion accuses her of robbing him and she is arrested.

The poor disfranchised girl, without money, friends or influence, is about to be convicted on utterly false testimony when Aunt Jane hears of her plight. The old lady arrives in court just in time to denounce the injustice of the proceedings and save Cornelia from a prison sentence. She secures Cornelia a posiion in a canning factory owned by Ricketts, a friend of Austin. Ricketts is an employer of child labor in evasion of the law.

In the meantime things in the Austin home are going from bad to worse. Rosalind attempts to stop one of her husband's drinking debauches and orders Ricketts from the house. She flees with her two little daughters to her aunt's home, but her husband secures a court order compelling her to return the children.

Austin discovers Cornelia's presence in his friend's factory and has her discharged. Baffled in his efforts to secure more money from Rosalind he attempts to force Cornelia to reveal to his wife their relations. In the struggle which follows Cornelia seizes a pair of shears and gives Austin a wound from which a few days later he dies. Cornelia is arrested and dies in the prison hospital while awaiting trial.

On his death bed Austin learns that he has inherited a fortune from an uncle. A villain to the last, he wills this wealth to his father. And not only that, but he bequeaths his two daughters to his father's care, as the laws of the State allow him to do.

At their grandfather's home the two little girls are treated with the greatest brutality. The law makes Rosalind powerless to aid her children and besides she is almost penniless.

While the elder girl, Beatrice, is ill with scarlet fever—contracted from wearing clothing made in an unsanitary tenement—Ricketts secures possession of her sister, Helen. In revenge for Rosalind's treatment of him he gives Helen to the poverty-striken Weeds, who sends her to work in the canning factory.

Through a kind-hearted watchman at the factory Helen manages to let her mother know of her whereabouts. With Aunt Jane's assistance the child is rescued, and later Beatrice is kidnapped from her grandfather's home, which is for her little more than a prison. Aunt Jane advises Rosalind to flee with the two children.

The distracted mother makes the attempt by a midnight trip in a motor car. But before she has reached the State line, which means safety for her and her children, an officer overtakes her and arrests her for abduction.

A suffragists lawyer, Belle Justly, fights Rosalind's case so well that she is eventually acquitted and her children are restored to her. Then Rosalind realizes for the first time the law's injustice to women, and she becomes an enthusiastic worker in the suffrage cause.

Under the able leadership of Rosalind the women of the State finally win the right to vote. During the campaign she becomes acquainted with Lieutenant-Governor Merriman, who is a staunch supporter of the women's cause. Their friendship ripens into love, and shortly after the suffrage bill is signed they are married.

The closing scenes of the photoplay show the jubilation which follows victory for the suffrage bill and some of the many changes for the better which results from women having the vote.

"Your Girl and Mine" will be shown for the first time in Chicago next Wednesday. It will then be presented in leading theatres everywhere.

How We Save $2,000,000,000 If We Buy Things 'Made in America'

By Harry Tipper,

President of the Advertising Men's League, Director "Made in America" Products Association, Lecturer on Advertising, New York University, Advertising Manager The Texas Company.

AMERICANS are spending nearly two billion dollars a year for foreign made articles. There is no good reason why this money should not be kept in America and spent for articles "Made in U. S. A."

The tremendous recent growth of Germany's business at home and abroad is due to a proper appreciation of the fact that German-made goods should be pushed in foreign countries and also that none but German-made goods should be purchased in Germany.

Here is a very suggestive circular which has been sent all over the empire by the various German Chambers of Commerce:

1—In all expenses keep in mind the interests of your own compatriots.

2—Never forget that when you buy foreign articles your own country is poorer.

3—Your money should profit no one but the Germans.

4—Never profane German factories by using foreign machinery.

5—Never allow foreign eatables to be served on your table.

6—Write on German paper with a German pen, and use German blotting paper.

7—Use German flour, eat German fruit, and drink German Beer. These alone give your body the true German energy.

8—If you don't like German Malt coffee, drink coffee from the German Colonies.

9—Use only German clothes for your dress and German hats for your head.

10—Let no foreign flattery distract you from these precepts, and be firmly convinced that whatever others may say, German products are the only ones worthy of the citizens of the German fatherland.

If we substitute the word American for the word German all through that appeal, and live up to it, we will have two billion more American dollars paid to the American business and industrial world.

Why should Americans buy "imported" goods? Usually they cost more; are they any better?

Everybody knows of common knowledge that no where in the world can anybody match American shoes, American sewing-machines, American low-priced automobiles. If this is true, as all admit, of these three commodities is it also true of the thousand and more of other manufactured articles? That is what the manufacturers are going to prove and the "Made in America Products Association" has just been incorporated to help to demonstrate it to the American public.

Some of the largest retailers throughout the country are pushing American-made goods. Many of them, indeed, have hitherto lauded the merits of the imported articles, for which, in most cases, they obtained advanced prices, but are now swinging into line and booming American-made goods instead.

It is declared by American manufacturers that the demand for "imported" articles is a fad. If it is, it is a fad which is costing this country hundreds of million dollars a year.

Take, for instance, the vast volume of manufactured articles imported in a state ready for consumption. During the year ending June, 1914, they amounted to nearly half a billion dollars—to be exact, $448,312,948.

Abraham Lincoln is reported as having said that while he was not much of an economist, it seemed very clear to him that when we buy foreign-made goods we get the goods and the foreign country gets the money, but when we buy home-made goods we get the goods and the money too.

Why is it that Americans have found it desirable to consume such a vast quantity of imported manufactures when our own industries the country over have been suffering from hard times?

The people who buy "imported" articles in preference to American-made goods may be roughly divided into four classes.

Class 1—Americans who are willing to make sacrifices in order to be exclusive, and who prefer "imported" articles, which cost more, because the average individual uses American-made goods.

Class 2—Uninformed consumers who have an idea that because a thing is imported and more expensive it must be superior.

Class 3—Foreigners living here who show a preference for the products of the fatherland.

Class 4—Consumers who buy imported articles because there is no American-made equivalent, or the American-made article is inferior or dearer.

Perhaps the most important class of consumers of foreign-made articles consists of those who labor under the idea that because imported articles are usually more expensive they must necessarily be superior and more desirable than American-made goods. Hundreds of million dollars are undoubtedly sent abroad every year by Americans who would just as soon patronize American industries if they understood the facts. This fallacy about imported articles being necessarily superior must be cleared away. The consumer must be enlightened.

Take, as a typical example familiar to almost every business man, the instance of beer. How many men who go into a restaurant and order "imported" beer in preference to domestic are influenced by any other consideration than the fact that the imported costs ten cents a glass, while the domestic costs only five, the natural inference being subconsciously drawn that because the imported article costs twice as much as the domestic it must be twice as good?

Here are the facts: On every gallon of imported beer a duty of fifty cents has been paid. There are approximately sixteen glasses to the gallon. That means that a duty of three and one-eighth cents has been paid on every glass. The item of freight, insurance and other items involved in its transportation adds another one and seven-eighth cents to the tax on each glass, and reveals that the diner who pays ten cents for a glass of "imported" beer is paying five cents for the beer and five cents for the duty, etc. And this is true of many other dutiable articles for which Americans pay an advanced price under the mistaken idea that the difference in price represents added value, when as a matter of fact it is tacked on merely to cover the duty and other charges incident to its importation.

As far as the relative merits of "imported" and domestic beer are concerned, all that it is necessary to say is that domestic beer is every bit as pure, every bit as nutritious, every bit as beneficial as the "imported." The fact that there may be a slight difference in taste may warrant foreigners, who are accustomed to it, in demanding it, but certainly does not justify Americans in paying twice as much for it.

The American textile industry has suffered perhaps as much as any from the unreasonable demand for "imported" goods. Over $100,000,000 worth of foreign wool and cotton manufactures are purchased by Americans every year.

Of this vast amount of merchandise it must be admitted that a fair proportion represents products which are superior in quality or cheaper in price than the domestic equivalent, but, on the other hand, many million dollars are annually paid over to foreigners by American citizens for fabrics and wearing apparel which are in no respect superior to the domestic variety.

As has been pointed out by the textile trade journals, the manufacturers themselves are largely to blame for the preference which is given in many quarters to "imported" fabrics. They not only permit their high-grade cloths to be marked "foreign," while the medium and low-grade goods are invariably offered as of domestic origin, but they actually encourage the practice.

One of the leading trade journals in this field recently declared that it knew of a large New England mill which manufactured a very large yardage of fancy worsteds for an importing house, with special selvedges, packed in such a manner and with such tickets as to lead the secondary buyer to suppose they were really what they purported to be, of foreign manufacture.

In the manufacture of fabrics containing a minimum of wool it is admitted that certain foreign weavers are more efficient than we are, but as far as the better grade of fabrics go, the American consumer will make no mistake in demanding American-made goods, even though persuaded to purchase the more expensive "imported" offerings. Here again it must be remembered that the difference in price represents, first, the duty; second, the freight, and other incidental transportation charges, and third, an added tax on American credulity and ignorance. As long as Americans continue to believe that imported goods are necessarily superior to domestic so long will foreign manufacturers require them to pay for the imaginary superiority.

What more convincing argument can be needed to prove that American-made goods are the equal if not the superior of foreign-made products than the fact that we export more than any other nation in the world, except the United Kingdom? In other words, in the markets of the world American-made products are more highly esteemed than those of any other nation, except Great Britain, and this despite the fact that American-made goods almost invariably command higher prices.

Now, if the world at large finds American-made goods so desirable, why should Americans themselves show a preference for foreign goods?

The figures for 1912 showed the list of exports to be as follows:

United Kingdom	$2,371,073,000
United States	2,204,322,409
Germany	2,131,718,000
France	1,295,528,000
Netherlands	1,251,472,000

It is true that in the matter of labor the rest of the world has some advantage over the United States. We pay our employes higher wages.

But this one disadvantage, great as it may be in manufactures in which labor constitutes the principal item of cost, is largely off-set by our unsurpassed mechanical skill.

If one has any doubt as to the ability of American manufacturers to excel the world in any industry which they take up seriously, it is only necessary to refer to the history of one of the newest of them all—the automobile industry.

When automobiles first made their appearance France and Italy obtained a monopoly of the business. Thus, in 1906, we imported $4,910,208 worth and exported $4,409,136. Within the next few years American manufacturers took up the industry in earnest and in 1911 our imports had dwindled to $2,446,248 and our exports had jumped to $21,636,661. In the following year the imports went down to $2,000,000 and our exports rose to $26,012,934.

Last year we imported just 300 automobiles, worth $520,493, and exported some 30,000, worth $26,574,574.

Here is an example of the development of an industry which might be duplicated in almost any field, if the American consumer would only realize that just as Americans can build automobiles which excel those of any other nation, so they can weave superior fabrics, make finer clothes, manufacture better food-stuffs, and, in short, produce a more desirable example of almost every other commodity for which so many Americans now look to foreign countries.

Of course, the responsibility rests upon the manufacturers themselves to a large extent. They must improve products which are at present inferior to those of foreign nations and develop industries which we have hitherto allowed other nations to monopolize.

We cannot expect Americans to favor American-made products from a patriotic standpoint merely. American-made goods must be superior to foreign-made, or American manufacturers cannot expect to control American patronage.

Take, for instance, the chemical and drug industry, in which Germany has developed a practical monopoly, to such an extent, as far as we are concerned, that we are dependent upon her for at least 90 per cent of the dyestuffs we require in this country. In this very important industry, upon which so many other industries are dependent, we have been shockingly deficient.

So good an authority as A. H. Cosden, president of the Riker-Hegeman Company, pointed out in this paper a week or two ago that there is no reason at all why we should allow this situation to continue. In a number of cases which he specified he showed that America can produce drugs, chemicals and food-stuffs of a grade superior to those now imported, but has neglected its opportunities in this respect solely because of the desire on the part of many Americans for "imported" articles.

One Home and One Woman Enough For Any Man

By G. K. CHESTERTON,
the Distinguished English Essayist.

IT seems singular that nobody (so far as I know), except Mrs. Belloc-Lowndes in the New Witness, has noted a quality in the Caillaux case which is quite apart from its criminality or innocence, and does not pre-judge the result. I, for one, should count it a point of conscience not to pre-judge any such result. The best test of honesty is whether we obey laws in a land where they cannot be enforced. I have always thought the rule against prejudicing an impartial tribunal was a fair rule; and it would be despicable to observe it in one's own country and despise it in another.

But the very interesting point raised by Mrs. Belloc-Lowndes has nothing to do with the legal issue of the legal prosecution. She points out that, whoever may be right in the quarrel, there never would have been any quarrel but for the vast license of divorce allowed in France since M. Naquet's law was passed. Now, this is really one of the great realities of the modern world. Whatever be the cause, whatever be the complexities, it is quite certain that the two highly cultivated democracies which have allowed a large divorce are now rather wishing they hadn't. You will not find this in the daily papers. You will not find anything in the daily papers except things that happened a hundred years ago—and things that didn't happen the day before yesterday. The paradox of our public Press has reached such a point that a weekly paper is generally ahead of a daily paper; and a monthly paper more on the spot than either. It is no part of the business of our average daily Press to tell us what real Frenchmen or real Americans are really talking about. But if they did report the recent and real things, if they put down word for word what was said in a Paris cafe or a Californian saloon, it is quite on the cards that the speakers would be considering what Mrs. Belloc-Lowndes was considering: the looseness and the landslide of divorce.

That is the fresh and arresting fact, both in France and America. In both countries all kinds of people are now talking about divorce as if it were a calamity coming upon their country from the outside: like cholera or military invasion. It has become impersonal, like what we call a problem. New York divorcees talk about divorce, just as London drinkers talk about drink. They talk of it as a public plague, quite apart from the question of whether it is a private sin. Mrs. Belloc-Lowndes, who is for many reasons a sane judge as between the old French Republicans and the new French Nationalists, says seriously that nobody of an older generation, "however Voltairian," does not regret the flux of fickleness into which, through the new divorce laws, the French family life has fallen. And though I could not test the French case at all thoroughly, I can say that this confirms what I have heard from all my American friends, and read in numberless American books and magazines, about the dangers of divorce in America. But we in England are what is called a backward nation. And the most backward thing we are doing is to attempt to extend to the poor the divorce which has already driven the two most advanced nations to despair.

The disadvantage of that sort of divorce is that it introduces into daily life a perpetual element of disturbance (or a doubt of disturbance) which human nature was not made to endure. It is as if the door-knocker knocked and ran away, taking the door with it. It is as if the staircase started sliding down the bannisters. There must be a firm framework for human life.

If you pull that framework to pieces, and try to patch and repatch it, you will find at last that it is past repair. You will discover what will be to you, as it is to me, an exceedingly annoying fact: that the years of a man's life are three-score and ten. You will be content with one companion for so brief and thrilling an adventure. You will not go in for that speculative polygamy which is far more profligate than practical polygamy. You will not even go in for bigamy. For bigamy is Dual Personality: and that way madness lies.

The more a modern European man thinks of the question, apart from his Pagan passions or his Puritan fads, the more he will come to the conclusion that one home is as much as one man or woman can manage; and that being married again is like being put into breeches again. There are many possible pairs of trousers, of vivid colors and varied design. But they will not give you the ancient pleasure.